## AFTER FINAL REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Application #	09/682,775
Confirmation #	4210
Filing Date	October 18, 2001
First Inventor	HARMS
Art Unit	2191
Examiner	Vo, Ted T.
Docket #	P08629US00/RFH

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

SIR:

In response to the final Office Action mailed October 23, 2006, in which all pending claims, claims 1-26 and 29-32, were rejected, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections to the claims and allow all of the claims based on the discussion which follows.

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Microsoft Systems Journal (hereinafter "Microsoft"), "Under The Hood," 9-1996.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-16 are not anticipated by Microsoft, as Microsoft fails to teach or suggest the present method, which is directed to removing entry of a device from a computer system which is not properly identified. As would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art, and fully consistent with how the term is used in the present specification, a device includes, but is not limited to, peripherals such as disk drives, printers, USB devices, etc.

In sharp contrast to the present method, Microsoft discloses a method for removing entry of a filename from a computer system registry when the corresponding file is not found on a computer system's hard drive. To this end, Microsoft teaches scanning a registry to identify and extract filenames, followed by scanning a hard drive, in order to determine whether that file exists. If the file corresponding to the registry's